

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2009

FAX**Mr. Andrew Millikin
/Mr. Walter Benson****To: Art Unit 2837****From: Seiji Kashioka****Fax: 571-273-8300****Pages: 2 sheets****Phone: 571-270-1265****Date: 8.3.2009****Re: Application/Control#
10/593,889****CC:**☒ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☒ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle**Comments:****RE: Application /Control No. 10/593,889*********Send again because my phone/fax number was missing in yesterday's fax.*******

Dear Mr. Millikin,

Thank you for examination of my application.

I am preparing RCE and response to office action mailed on 5/7/2009 for above application.

I have a trouble to respond to item No. 1 in your Detailed Action. And I need your instruction.

Purpose of re-writing specification is, as you told in Office Action of 10/20/2008, to make "specification to be written in "full, clear, concise and exact terms". But, It seems English has not distinguishable two words for two concepts both expressed by "beat".

I used two words "takt" and "beat" in original specification to distinguish concepts they represent.

8.3.2009

AUG 04 2009

takt --- timing corresponding end point of movement of conductor's baton or a metronome.

beat -- timing or time length of basic note corresponding to denominator in time signature.

As you warned, "takt" is not English but German word. I don't know other word than "beat" as English translation. So, I replace it with "beat". Then, I need replace **"beat" in original specification** with some English expression other than single word "beat". I thought "basic note corresponding to denominator" in [0039] and "said basic notes" and "basic note" in [0040] were just replacement to make it exact terms, and did not think they were new matter. Without replacement, phrase in 7th line of [0039] becomes

"beat number in one beat" .

You can see this is nonsense. How about "beat written in meter" or more simply "beat in meter" for replacement of "beat" in original specification?

Amendment to [0002] is added to make clear for reader the use of terminology related beat. It is known as base knowledge at least to orchestra musicians. It does not contain description about invention. But, I do not insist to add this explanation. Please instruct about this.

Amendment in [0007] and [0054] are not vital, and I can resume to original.

Replacements in [0051] were to correct error happened in translation process (Japanese to English). You can see it in original PCT application PCT/IB2005/000715. What is the procedure to correct translation error? Can I do it now with the amendment?

My FAX number is 909-594-4991, and e-mail address is kashioka@oak-hill.com.

Sincerely,



Seiji Kashioka

8.3.2009